

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 DAVID ROBERTS,) Case No.: 1:20-cv-00592-SAB (PC)
12 Plaintiff,)
13 v.) ORDER FOR PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE
14 STEPHEN HENDERSON, *et al.*,) WHY ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
15 Defendants.) FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH A COURT
16) ORDER, FAILURE TO STATE A COGNIZABLE
17) CLAIM, AND FAILURE TO PROSECUTE
) [ECF No. 14]
)
)
)

18 Plaintiff David Roberts is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action
19 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

20 On June 17, 2020, the Court screened Plaintiff's first complaint, found no cognizable claims,
21 and granted Plaintiff thirty days to file an amended complaint. (ECF No. 15.) Although on June 29,
22 2020, Plaintiff filed a notice (self dated June 23, 2020) indicating that an amended complaint was
23 submitted, no second amended complaint has been received and/or filed by the Court. (ECF No. 16.)
24 Accordingly, within **fourteen (14)** days from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause
25 in writing why the action should not be dismissed. (*Id.*) Plaintiff is warned that failure to comply with

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 this order will result in a recommendation to a District Judge that the instant action be dismissed, with
2 prejudice, for failure to prosecute, failure to obey a court order, and failure to state a cognizable claim
3 for relief.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: July 27, 2020


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE